



Did the Babylonian Temples Have Libraries?

Author(s): Morris Jastrow, Jr.

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 27 (1906), pp. 147-182

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/592857>

Accessed: 04/05/2013 09:06

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

Did the Babylonian Temples have Libraries?—By MORRIS JASTROW, Jr., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

THE main source for our knowledge of the literature—in the proper sense—produced in ancient Babylonia is still the remarkable collection made chiefly¹ by king Ashurbanapal of Assyria (668-626 B. C.) which was discovered by Sir Austen Henry Layard in 1849 in the king's palace at Nineveh. Layard came across several rooms in the so-called South-West palace at Kouyunjik (opposite Mosul) filled with clay tablets of varying size.² Subsequent excavations and searches for further tablets in the palace in question were made by Rawlinson (1853-55), Rassam (1854, 1877-1883), George Smith (1873, 1874-1876), Budge (1888, 1889, 1891), King and Thompson (1903). Through these combined efforts the number of tablets recovered was considerably increased until at present somewhat over 20,000 tablets and fragments have found their way to the British

¹ Bezold in the Introduction to his magnificent *Catalogue of the Cuneiform Tablets in the Kouyunjik Collection of the British Museum* (5 vols. London, 1889-1899), vol. v, p. xiii, accepts as satisfactory the evidence that the collection existed "in a humble form" in the days of Sargon (722-705), the great-grandfather of Ashurbanapal, and that additions were made to it by Sennacherib (705-681) and Esarhaddon (681-668). See also British Museum *Guide to the Babylonian and Assyrian Antiquities* (London, 1900), p. 34, and Bezold's suggestive remarks in his article "Bibliotheks- und Schriftwesen im alten Nineve" (*Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, xxi (1904), p. 273. A tablet like K. 3600—a hymn addressed to Nanâ by Sargon—is almost conclusive evidence in favor of this view. Likewise tablets like KK. 9452 and 9487—copies made by contemporaries of Sargon and Sennacherib.

² Layard, in his account of the discovery (*Nineveh and Babylon* [London, 1853], pp. 344-347), speaks chiefly of two rooms but mentions also adjoining chambers containing tablets "but in far smaller numbers." The Library, it thus appears, was stored in several rooms. The size of the tablets varies (see Bezold, *l. c.*, p. xv) from 15×8½ inches to 1×¾ inches.

Museum.¹ The size of the collection in connection with the large variety of subjects represented,² together with what we know of the manner in which the collection was made, make it in the full sense of the word a Library, and the designation "Ashurbanapal's Library" has therefore become a general one for this royal collection of tablets—and properly so.

When it became evident that the Library as indicated already in a number of the cases by the subscripts,³ apart from internal

¹Of this number about 14,000 constitute the original Kouyunjik collection gathered by Layard, and the rest—marked off by the date or source of acquisition into 29 separate collections—were secured by the subsequent explorations. A small number of tablets from the Library found their way to other museums or into private collections (see Bezold, *l. c.*, p. xv). Numerous inscriptions and inscribed objects (clay cylinders, clay seals, vase fragments, bricks, obelisks, etc.) and other objects (jars, spearheads, nails, ornaments, etc.) included in the Kouyunjik collection have nothing to do with the Library proper, and there are also quite a number of tablets entered as Kouyunjik inscriptions (as e. g., KK. 6697, 8755, 8860, 8866, 9288, 9599, 9920, 11958; DT. 108, 260; Rm 2, 588, 81-7-27, 205, 209, 210, 213, etc., etc.) which do not appear to have come from that place. See Bezold, "Bibliotheks- und Schriftwesen im alten Nineve (*Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen*, xxi. (1904), p. 259, note, and Bezold's catalogue, p. 1952.

²See, e. g., the survey in Bezold's Introduction, *l. c.*, pp. xviii-xxviii, and Menant's *La Bibliothèque du Palais de Ninéve* (Paris, 1880), Chap. iii, though this latter work can no longer be recommended as a guide.

³These subscripts are of two kinds, (1) either a brief indication that the tablet in question is "the property of king Ashurbanapal of Assyria," which, as Bezold (*Bibliothekswesen*, etc., p. 275) has pointed out, appears to have been stamped upon the tablet and often accompanies (2) a longer colophon furnishing the name and number of the series to which the tablet belongs, a more or less stereotyped form of praise for Ashurbanapal for having followed the promptings of Nebo the god of wisdom and of his consort Tashmitum, (or in some instances other gods, e. g. Shamash and Adad in the case of omen tablets; see Boissier, *Documents Assyriens relatifs aux Presages*, p. 232, and *Cuneiform Texts*, etc., Part xx, pl. 33), to gather the wisdom of the ages in his palace, with further references in many cases that a text represents a copy of an older one, or an extract, while in some instances the name of the copyist or owner is added and the source of the original text—Akkad, Babylon, Cuthah, Nippur and Ashur—specifically stated. That more subscripts are not preserved is due of course to the fragmentary condition of most of the tablets; and while it does not follow that all the tablets were provided with more or less explicit subscripts, this was certainly the case with all the tablets belonging to a series and in many other instances. See further Bezold's article (*l. c.*) p. 275 seq.

evidence, contained copies of texts that were produced in Babylonia and the general dependence of the Assyrian culture,—including more particularly the art, the religion, and the literary activity,—upon Babylonia became manifest, the hope was naturally entertained that when once the excavations should be extended to the mounds in the south, covering the remains of Babylonian cities, extensive literary archives would be unearthed in the temples, furnishing the originals of which the ambitious king had copies prepared by his scribes. This hope has up to the present not been realized, and there are reasons for believing that the temples of Babylonia did not, with perhaps a single exception—possibly two exceptions—possess extensive literary collections. In other words, the only Library as yet found in the Mesopotamian excavations is the royal collection of Nineveh; and in view of the unfortunate confusion that has recently been created in regard to “Temple Libraries,” it seems useful to investigate, on the basis of the material actually found in Babylonian mounds, whether we are justified in assuming that the Babylonian temples even in the important religious centers as a rule had libraries.

Three Babylonian mounds of primary importance have been pretty thoroughly explored—Telloh, Abu Habba and Nippur, while a fourth site—Babylon—has been the scene of active excavations since 1899,¹ so that we are justified in drawing certain conclusions as to the general character of Babylonian mounds, though naturally with that reserve which the factor of uncertainty as to what the future may have in store suggests. Confining ourselves for the present to the first three mounds, it is to be noted that all three represent most important cities of ancient Babylonia, Telloh being the site of Lagash (or Shirpurla), that played a significant rôle in early Babylonian history; Abu Habba, the site of Sippar, which was one of the chief centers of sun-worship and likewise of political importance at various periods; while Nippur, certainly one of the most ancient

¹ By the German Orient Society. See the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft zu Berlin*, published every few months and containing reports of the progress of the work. A convenient conspectus of explorations in Babylonia and Assyria will be found in Delitzsch's *Assyrische Grammatik* (2d ed., Berlin, 1906), pp. 1-4, which, however, omits to mention the work at Bismya under Dr. E. J. Banks.

cities of Babylonia, was at one time the center of a kingdom of considerable extent, and which, after finally yielding its political prerogatives to the city of Babylon, continued down to a very late period to enjoy sacred distinction as the seat of the worship of Bel—once the head of the Babylonian pantheon. At all three sites a large number of tablets have been found within the precincts of the chief temple at each place—but what is the character of these tablets?

At Telloh, apart from numerous inscriptions on bricks, cones, stones, statues, statuettes, votive objects and sculptured monuments and the like,¹ a large temple archive, but wholly of a business and administrative character, was discovered by De Sarzec in the course of his excavations in 1894–95.² During a temporary interruption of the excavations, the ruins were plundered and most of the tablets scattered through dealers in all parts of the world. It is estimated that above 30,000 clay tablets from Telloh are to be found in the museums of Europe and America and in private collections or still in the hands of dealers, though this number would seem to be somewhat too high. The tablets³ are without exception of a business character, dealing for the most part with the accounts, the sacrifices, the officials and employees and miscellaneous business affairs of the temple of

¹ De Sarzec, *Découvertes en Chaldée* (Paris, 1889 +). The excavations conducted by De Sarzec from 1877 to his death in 1901 are now being continued by M. Croz.

² Specimens in De Sarzec *ib.* pl. 41. See the account of the discovery of the archive by Heuzey, *Revue d'Assyriologie*, iv, pp. 65–68.

³ Several extensive publications of tablets from the Temple Archive of Telloh have already appeared, notably, Reisner, *Tempelurkunden aus Telloh* (Berlin, 1901), Thureau-Dangin, *Recueil de Tablettes Chaldéennes* (Paris, 1903), same, *Notice sur la Troisième collection de Tablettes*, etc. (*Revue d'Assyriologie* v, pp. 67–98), also in Parts iii. vii and ix of the *British Museum Series of Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, etc., and Barton, *Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets* (Phila. 1906), or *Documents from the Temple Archives of Telloh*. The first publication of Telloh tablets was by W. R. Arnold, who properly designated his volume as “*Ancient Babylonian Temple Records*” (N. Y., 1896). The texts form part of the Telloh tablets in the possession of Columbia University. A further instalment of this collection will shortly be published by Dr. R. J. Lau. In Radau's *Early Babylonian History* (N. Y., 1900) are included the Telloh tablets in the General Theological Seminary. Virolleaud, *Comptabilité Chaldéenne* (2 parts, Poitiers, 1903), comprises a publication of Telloh tablets in Constantinople.

Ningirsu at Lagash and of other temples at that place, while a small proportion deal with the business of private individuals.¹ All the tablets belong to the older period, i. e. before Hammurabi.

At Abu Habba it is estimated about 50,000 clay tablets have been found through the excavations conducted by Rassam (1881-82) and Scheil (1894), supplemented by extensive private diggings through thievish Arabs. Beside the very large collection of Abu Habba tablets secured through Dr. Budge for the British Museum,² partly by Rassam and partly by subsequent purchases, collections from the Abu Habba archive were purchased by the University of Pennsylvania,³ by the Berlin Museum,⁴ the Metropolitan Museum and other institutions. These tablets, found within the precincts of the temple of the sun-god, are likewise, with the exception of several hundred, of a business character, (a) either connected with the temple administration—contracts, sales, work accounts, etc.—or (b) of a private character, including in both sections letters. Both the older—the Hammurabi—period⁵ and the

¹ See, e. g., Barton, *l. c.*, p. 7.

² See Meissner, *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht* p. 2, and King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, I, p. xx.

³ See R. F. Harper, *Hebraica* vi, pp. 59-60 and *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, iv, pp. 163-164; also Peters, *Nippur*, vol. i, pp. 16 and 297, and Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 302, note. A publication of a considerable portion of this collection by Dr. H. Ranke is now ready for the press. From internal evidence, Dr. Ranke has determined that most of the tablets of the Khabaza collection (purchased in two instalments) come from Abu Habba. See also Peters, *l. c.*, ii, p. 50. Included in the Khabaza collection is the Astronomical tablet which Hilprecht, *l. c.*, p. 532, reproduced as an "Astronomical tablet from the Temple Library" at Nippur, although it was purchased at Bagdad *before even* the Nippur excavations had begun and eleven years before the announcement of the discovery of the Nippur "Library." The "Lushtamar" tablet, purchased July 5, 1889 at Bagdad and a mathematical tablet bought some time in 1839—both represented by Hilprecht as having been excavated at Nippur in 1900—also come from Abu Habba. See below, p. 159, note 1. Whether the tablets from the Shemtob collection purchased by the University of Pennsylvania in London in 1888 (see Harper, *Hebraica*, v, pp. 74-76) also come wholly from Sippar, as Meissner (*l. c.*, p. 2, note) believes, or in part from Babylon, has not yet been determined.

⁴ Meissner, *l. c.*, p. 2.

⁵ Publications of the documents of the older period in (a) *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, etc. in the British Museum, Parts ii, iv, vi and viii; (b) Meissner, *Beiträge zum altbabylonischen Privatrecht* (Leipzig, 1893); (c) Scheil, *Une Saison de Fouilles à Sippar* (Cairo, 1903), pp. 99, 102,

later—the neo-Babylonian period¹—are richly represented. The mixture of official and private documents suggests that at Sippar, as elsewhere, the temples were the depositories of all kinds of legal documents, and we may assume that, in the larger centers at all events, the temple archives always included these two classes of business documents—official and private.

An interesting feature of the temple archive at Sippar is the evidence furnished by Scheil's excavations for the existence of a temple school within the temple precincts. In Scheil's work *Une Saison de Fouilles à Sippar* (Cairo, 1903), a special chapter² is devoted to an account of the school, which contained writing exercises, sign lists, syllabaries, grammatical paradigms, lists of measures and multiplication and other mathematical tablets.³ To the school belong also the astronomical tablets, of

107-115; (d) Thomas Friedrich, *Altbabylonische Urkunden aus Sippar* (Beiträge zur Assyriologie v, Heft 4); (e) Ranke, *Tablets dated in the Reigns of the Rulers of the first dynasty* (ready for the press). See above, p. 151, note 3. (f) Many of the official letters included in King's *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, (London, 1899), vol. ii, are addressed to officials at Sippar and must therefore have come from the archive at that place. See the list in King, *l. c.* II, pp. xiv-xviii. Those not from Sippar come from Babylon. Specimens of business letters of the Hammurabi period, also in Scheil, *l. c.*, pp. 105, 133, etc. and Friedrich, *l. c.*, p. 71. The "Lushtamar" table above (p. 151) referred to is of the Hammurabi period and will, no doubt, when once opened, likewise turn out to be a business letter of just the same character as these specimens. It may be of interest to note, as further confirming the view that this letter comes from Sippar, that the name Lushtamar, of which Ranke in his work *Early Babylonian Personal Names*, p. 119, notes twelve instances—either as an element in a longer name or by itself—is characteristic of "Sippar" business documents. Of the twelve, eleven certainly occur in documents from Sippar and the same probably holds good for the twelfth instance. Two further instances of the name occur in the Sippar tablets published by Friedrich, *l. c.*, pp. 423 and 434. Under the form Lultamar it occurs five times—as Dr. Clay informs me—in the temple documents of the Cassite archives at Nippur.

¹ Of the later period many hundreds are included in Strassmaier's series of *Babylonische Texte* (Leipzig, 1889-97) of the days of Nebuchadnezzar II, Nabonidus, Cyrus, Cambyses and Darius, and in Evetts, *Inscriptions of the Reigns of Evil-Merodach, Neriglissar, and Laborsarchod* (Leipzig, 1892). ² Chap. III, L'École à Sippar (pp. 80-54).

³ Specimens of mathematical tablets in Scheil, *l. c.*, p. 48 seq. The multiplication tablet above referred to (p. 151, note 3) is exactly of the same nature as those found at Abu Habba, e. g., Scheil, *l. c.*, p. 132 (No. 289). See also IV Rawlinson (2d ed.), pl. 41, for specimens of such multiplication tables from Ashurbanapal's library.

which a number have been found.¹ In addition, there have also been found at Sippar, a considerable number of texts of a distinctly literary character, such as hymns, prayers, incantations,² a fragment of a deluge³ narrative belonging to the Hammurabi period, a fragment in neo-Babylonian script of an important religious text⁴ which is a duplicate of several Assyrian copies of this text known to us from Ashurbanapal's Library,⁵ and more of the like. In the Khabaza collection from Sippar, purchased by the University of Pennsylvania, there are, similarly, in addition to some syllabaries, a number of hymns, incantations and other religious texts.⁶ These literary texts likewise formed part of the equipment of the temple school, used in connection with the education of the young aspirants to the priesthood, as part of their training for the practical cult.⁷ The conjecture may be hazarded that the portion of the temple set aside for the school would be the natural place, also, in which the texts actually used in connection with the temple ritual in its various ramifications, or consulted in connection with the various functions of the priests, would be stored, just as among the Jews in the Middle Ages, the school generally adjoined the synagogue and served as the place of deposit for the ritualistic handbooks and guides, in addition to the school outfit proper.⁸ At all events, in view of the considerable number of literary texts found by Scheil—apart from such texts in purchased collections from Sippar,—it is not likely that all should have been used as school exercises merely or for purposes of instruction, though we know that this was the case with some of them.⁹ The temple archive at Sip-

¹ E. g., Scheil, *l. c.*, p. 118 (No. 95).

² See the selection in Scheil, *l. c.*, pp. 95-141, where about 50 such texts are referred to. See also Scheil, *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la Philologie Égyptienne et Assyrienne*, xx, pp. 68 seq.

³ See Scheil, *Recueil de Travaux*, etc., xx, pp. 55-59.

⁴ Scheil, *l. c.*, p. 18, No. 37.

⁵ Published IV Rawlinson (2d ed.), pl. 60*. See the writer's paper, "A Babylonian Parallel to Job" (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. 25).

⁶ See Harper, *Hebraica*, vi, p. 60.

⁷ A survival of the establishment of schools within the temple appears in the Mohammedan schools set up within the precincts of the mosques.

⁸ Abrahams, *Jewish Life in the Middle Ages*, p. 34.

⁹ E. g., the above-mentioned Deluge fragment, which the colophon states was written by a *dupšar šiḫru*, i. e., "a young scribe" or pupil (Scheil, *Recueil de Travaux*, etc., xx, p. 58).

par, therefore, so far as recovered, consists of two divisions : (1) business documents—temple and private, for which the temple served as the place of deposit—corresponding to the office of the Recorder of Deeds in a modern municipal administration building ; (2) the temple school with its outfit, including some literary texts and constituting, perhaps, also the place of deposit for the texts needed by the priests in connection with the cult, the guides in the interpretation of omens, the incantation hand-books and the like.

Coming now to Nippur, the excavations conducted there under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania by Messrs. Peters and Haynes from 1889–1900¹ have yielded rich and valuable results—more particularly for the early political history of the Euphrates valley.² The recent unfortunate “Nippur controversy” (as it has been called) must not blind us to these results, for which Assyriological science is under lasting obligations to the institution and to the public-spirited citizens of Philadelphia for having fathered the enterprise, to Messrs. Peters³ and Haynes for having, amid hardships equalled only by the energy, skill and perseverance shown, secured precious material, and to Messrs. Hilprecht and Clay for their publication and partial interpretation of this material.⁴

¹ Divided into four campaigns, the first two (1889–90), under the direction of Dr. Peters, the third (1893–96) under Haynes, and the fourth (1899–1900) again under Haynes with Dr. Hilprecht as “Scientific Director” in the field for about ten weeks (March 1st to about the middle of May, 1900).

² It is only proper to note that the high dates assigned by Hilprecht for some of the historical documents have not been accepted, and there is a wholesome disposition at present among Assyriologists to be extremely cautious in regard to dates beyond 3000 B. C.

³ See Peters’ valuable work, *Nippur, or Explorations and Adventures on the Euphrates* (2 vols., New York, 1897).

⁴ Two volumes, chiefly of historical and votive texts by Hilprecht (Phila., 1893–1896), and two volumes of business documents of the Persian period (Phila. 1898–1904), the first appearing under the names of Hilprecht and Clay conjointly (though the copies of the texts were made by Clay), the latter by Clay alone. Two further volumes by Clay of business documents from the Cassite period have just appeared; and besides the volume by Ranke above referred to, Hilprecht has since early in 1905 announced three volumes by himself, consisting of syllabaries, writing exercises, etc.

Leaving aside the historical material and confining ourselves to the discoveries made within the precincts of the temple of Bel—the chief deity of Nippur, and at one time the head of the Babylonian pantheon—it appears that in January and February, 1900, Haynes struck a rich vein of tablets within the precincts of the Bel temple at the same locality where already, in the first and second campaigns, Peters had found several thousand tablets.¹ Much to the regret of scholars, the reliable data at our disposal in regard to the 17,200 tablets (or thereabouts) found by Haynes are still so meager, and the facts in the case have been so distorted, that a certain amount of caution is required whenever one touches upon a subject that one would prefer for the present to avoid, if it were possible to do so. So much, however, is certain, that no satisfactory evidence has been furnished for the existence of an extensive *literary* archive at Nippur which alone would merit the designation of a “Temple Library.” As at Abu Habbu (or Sippar), the mass of tablets found by Messrs. Peters and Haynes within the temple precinct are business documents, and just as at Abu Habba, the Hammurabi and the neo-Babylonian and Persian periods appear to be the ones chiefly represented. Again, as at Sippar, school exercises of various kinds were found, pointing to the existence of a temple school at Nippur that differed in no essential particular from that at Sippar; and if it should turn out that a certain number of distinctly literary tablets were unearthed by Haynes² (which is eminently likely), they would have to be judged *precisely* as the literary texts found at Sippar, as forming part of the school outfit, and in part perhaps representing texts kept in the school but used in connection with the cult.

In view of Dr. Peters’³ comprehensive and sober treatment of the misleading character of the description of the so-called

¹ See Peters, vol. i, p. 78. The locality in question is designated by him “Tablet Hill” or Mound No. V. In the plan, attached to Peters’ important paper on “The Nippur Library” (JAOS., vol. xxvi, p. 146), he designates this site by the Arabic numeral 5.

² According to Hilprecht (see below, p. 156) there were some literary tablets found by Peters on “Tablet Hill” in 1889-90, but this is questioned by the latter.

³ “The Nippur Library”—referred to above, and which was read before the American Oriental Society at Springfield, Mass., April 27, 1905.

"Temple Library" given by Dr. Hilprecht in three publications of his,¹ there is fortunately no need of entering into details here. Until a full and satisfactory explanation is furnished of the very serious matters to which Dr. Peters has called attention, his presentation of the case must perforce be accepted. In order, however, to establish the thesis that the character of the finds made within the temple precincts at Nippur is *precisely of the same order* as at Abu Habba, a survey of the situation is indispensable, more particularly in view of certain facts that have come to light since the appearance of Dr. Peters' paper and which are not as yet generally known to scholars. Apart from a personal disinclination towards all controversies, I should have preferred for various reasons to avoid a decidedly disagreeable topic, but in the interest of science the attempt must be made to clear away the confusion that has been created. It is with this endeavor in view, and because scholars have a right to know the facts in the case, that the subject is introduced here, so far as it bears upon the purpose of this paper.

According to Dr. Peters,² the tablets found on the "Library" site (or mound 5) in the first two campaigns (1889-90) were "of the ordinary so-called contract variety, transactions of barter, sale, and the like." If Dr. Hilprecht is to be trusted,³ there were, however, among the tablets so found—some

¹ (a) *Explorations in Bible Lands* (Phila., 1903), pp. 508-532 [republished in 1904 as the official history of the Nippur expedition]. (b) *Die Ausgrabungen der Universität von Pennsylvania im Bel-Tempel zu Nippur* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 52-62. (c) English translation of this monograph under the title *In the Temple of Bel at Nippur*, with the somewhat unusual sub-title, "A lecture delivered before German Court and University Circles," and published in the official Transactions of the Department of Archæology of the University of Pennsylvania (1904), vol. i, pp. 67-125.

² *Nippur*, vol. ii, pp. 197-200.

³ *Explorations*, etc., p. 511. Since Hilprecht claims in all three publications above referred to that he had concluded already in 1889 that mound 5 was the site of the "Library," the question naturally arises why with hymns, etc., turning up in 1889 or 1890, he should not then have announced or at least suggested his view? With so definite a conviction in his mind, it seems strange that he should have allowed the site to remain untouched for ten years. Even in 1900, although the "Scientific Director of the Expedition," he did not direct Haynes to dig on the site. Haynes struck the rich vein by accident.

4000 in all, so far as can be ascertained—also a few fragments of neo-Babylonian hymns, letters¹ and syllabaries.” From March 1890 till January 1900, this “Library” site *was not touched*. During January and February 1900, Haynes found, according to reports that are probably correct,² about 17,200 tablets in the mound in question. The first accounts of the find were given by Hilprecht in two articles,³ which appeared about the same time, one in the *Sunday School Times* (Phila.) of May 5, 1900, the other in the *Literarisches Centralblatt* of May 12 and May 19, 1900. Both communications were written at Nippur towards the end of March—a few weeks after Hilprecht’s arrival at the scene of excavations. In both communications Hilprecht announces the discovery of the “Temple Library,” and in both communications this announcement is made on the basis of his supposed examination of the 17,200 tablets,⁴ of which he gives a general description. Writing in a manner in both communications which distinctly conveys the impression that he was present when the “Library” was found, he dwells “on the absence of contract (or business) tablets,” and describes the “great mass” as consisting of tablets “of a lexicographical and linguistic character, and that it contained astronomical, mathematical and religious texts (hymns, prayers, etc.),⁵” and so forth. It is not generally known that upon these two accounts rest the subsequent more or less sensational reports, newspaper interviews, notices in popular journals and the like, regarding the so-called “Temple Library.” Even scholars had nothing more at their disposal as a guide until the appearance in 1903 of *Explorations in Bible Lands*, in which pp. 508–521 are devoted to an account of the “Temple Library.” It now turns out that not only was Dr. Hilprecht not present when

¹ Since the letters are no doubt of a business character, they would fall within Dr. Peters’ category of business documents.

² Hilprecht states (*Explorations*, etc., p. 509) that Haynes counted the tablets “as they were gathered day by day,” so that the number may be regarded as reliable.

³ To be quite accurate, one of the articles is in the form of a letter to Prof. Kittel of Leipzig.

⁴ So in the German article, whereas in the English article the number is given at 21,000, and the statement is added that this number “is rapidly increasing by new finds every day.”

⁵ *Liter. Centralblatt*, May 12, p. 834.

the so-called Library was found by Haynes, but by the time that Dr. Hilprecht arrived, i. e. March 1st, 1900, the vein was exhausted, no more tablets were being found, and all the tablets that had been unearthed had been *packed and boxed*, with the exception of a few—not more than twenty—kept out as specimens to show Dr. Hilprecht on his arrival.¹ The exact value, therefore, to be attached to the first announcements of what Dr. Hilprecht called “one of the most far-reaching archæological discoveries of the last century”² may be judged by any one.

Coming to the accounts of the “Library” in Hilprecht’s *Explorations in Bible Lands*, supplemented by his two other publications, Dr. Peters has shown in his paper³ how in order, apparently, to justify his earlier announcements, Dr. Hilprecht adopted a course for which it is difficult to find a suitable term. Of ten tablets and objects introduced by him in the three publications in question in his account of what was found on the site of the “Library” *not a single one* actually came from the Library. One—a multiplication table—was found by Dr. Peters in April, 1890, after the work on mound 5 had been closed and at a considerable distance from the “Library site,” and two were excavated during the third expedition, when (as Hilprecht himself states)⁴ the “Library” site was not touched; four were found during the fourth campaign, but *before* the “Library” site was touched, i. e., before January, 1900, and have therefore nothing to do with the “Library,” while three were not excavated at Nippur at all but were purchased at Bagdad, one—an astronomical tablet⁵—in January, 1889, *before* any of the

¹ This on the testimony of Mr. C. S. Fisher (who was at Nippur during the fourth campaign as the architect of the expedition), and confirmed by Mrs. Haynes. And yet in the letter to the *Sunday School Times* Hilprecht says that the number of tablets “is rapidly increasing by new finds every day”—this several weeks after the vein had been exhausted.

² *Explorations*, p. 508.

³ The Nippur Library, pp. 153-161. It should be noted that the correct explanation of the origin of the “Lushtamar” tablet (see below, p. 159), was not known at the time that Dr. Peters wrote his paper. It was not until the fall of 1905 that it was *definitely* ascertained that the tablet was purchased at Bagdad on July 5, 1889, by Mr. Noorian.

⁴ *Explorations*, p. 431.

⁵ This astronomical tablet is the one reproduced in *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 530, as “Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library.” It belongs to the Khabaza collection and comes from Sippar. See above, p. 151, note 3.

excavations of the University had begun; a second—a letter with the address “To Lushtamar”—on July 5, 1889, by Mr. Noorian;¹ the third—a multiplication table,—also purchased by Mr. Noorian in 1889.² Be it noted that in the accounts in which in no less than three publications these ten objects and tablets are described he is speaking *exclusively* of the finds made during the fourth campaign on the “Library” site, i. e., in January and February, 1900. Until, therefore, some satisfactory explanation for such methods is forthcoming, scholars are forced to maintain their present skeptical attitude towards further statements about the “Library” when unsupported by evidence.³ In view

¹ Dr. Hilprecht has claimed that he purchased the “Lushtamar” tablet from one of the Arab workmen at Nippur on April 18, 1889—one day after the first campaign had broken up; but there is *written* evidence that the tablet is one of seventeen purchased by Noorian at Bagdad on July 5, 1889, which is the *date* on the label to the tablet in Dr. Hilprecht's own handwriting. All seventeen came from Sippar and represent a purchase made out of a fund contributed by Prof. J. D. Prince of Columbia University.

² In regard to this multiplication table and the astronomical tablet, Hilprecht claims that he never at any time asserted, “verbally or in writing, that either of these purchased tablets was unearthed by him or by any expedition of the University at Nippur.” Such a claim is irreconcilable with the perfectly clear and unmistakable manner in which all three tablets are referred to by him in all three publications, as having been excavated in the fourth campaign in 1900. His language admits of no other interpretation.

³ While the question of the existence of a “Temple Library” is involved in the “Nippur controversy,” it is essential to emphasize that the *main* issue is not the existence or non-existence of a “Temple Library” at Nippur, but the *method* pursued by Dr. Hilprecht in the endeavor to establish the existence of such a “Library.” There might be a half dozen “Temple Libraries” at Nippur, and the obligation would still rest upon Dr. Hilprecht to explain to scholars what he meant, e. g., (1) in designating a tablet as an “Astronomical Tablet from the Temple Library” at Nippur which was purchased before even the excavations had begun, or (2) how he came to give a description of 17,200 tablets which he had never seen, or (3) what he meant by declaring that he purchased the “Lushtamar” letter near Nippur on April 18, 1889 (in order to make it plausible that the tablet came from Nippur), whereas it was bought by someone else at Bagdad, July 5, 1889, with a lot of others that came from Abu Habba. The persistent evasion of this main issue by Dr. Hilprecht has put the patience of scholars anxious to get at the truth to a severe test, and naturally has given rise to the suspicion that no satisfactory explanation can be given.

of this, there is no necessity to discuss the statement that besides 28,000 business documents, "23,000 literary tablets"¹ were found at Nippur, until some evidence for such a statement—involving as will be seen a sharp distinction between "business documents" and "literary tablets"—is forthcoming that will offset the wholly negative results to be gleaned from a critical examination of the various accounts given by Dr. Hilprecht of the contents of the "Temple Library."

It is, probably, perfectly safe to conclude that the bulk of the 17,200 tablets unearthed by Haynes will turn out to be documents of a business character, precisely as is the case with the bulk of the circa 4000 tablets found in the same locality in 1889-90. These tablets would therefore constitute a portion of the temple's business archive—precisely as at Telloh and Abu Habba,—and we may expect to find that both classes of business documents will be represented, (a) such as are connected with the business affairs of the temple² and (b) business documents of a private character deposited in the temple of Bel as the official depository.³ In addition to this, Haynes also appears to have struck the portion of the archive containing the outfit of the temple school—writing exercises, syllabaries, multiplication tables and the like—a condition that forms a complete parallel to the discoveries made at Abu Habba; and if it is true that among the

¹ *Ausgrabungen der Universität von Pennsylvania*, etc., p. 17; English translation, pp. 77 and 80. It may be worth while to note that at the time when Hilprecht was engaged in writing the accounts of the "Library," the boxes containing the tablets found by Haynes were lying unopened in the University Museum in the original packings. Exactly why Hilprecht hit upon "23,000 literary tablets" is not apparent. Did he perhaps take the 17,200 tablets of Haynes and the circa 4000 tablets of Peters and then add a thousand or two "for good measure"? But why 23,000 literary tablets?

² As is the case with the tablets from the Cassite period embodied in two volumes just now published by Prof. Clay, forming vols. 14-15 of the Babylonian series of the University, under the title *Business Documents from the Temple Archive at Nippur during the Cassite period*—dated and undated. These tablets were found in mound 10 of Peters' plan, which appears to have been the site of the archive in the Cassite period.

³ The two volumes of *Business Documents of Murashu Sons, of Nippur*, published by Hilprecht and Clay (1898-1904) represent tablets of a private archive found during the second campaign in mound 10.

circa 4000 tablets excavated during the first two campaigns, there are some syllabaries, hymns, etc., then it follows that Peters had already ten years previously come across the remains of the temple school. This view is confirmed by the official announcement of the Babylonian section of the University,¹ assuming of course that the tablets to be included in the forthcoming volumes represent such as were actually found at Nippur.

To be sure, in Dr. Hilprecht's account of this school we must eradicate all that he says about the instruction in "free-hand drawing, clay modelling, glyptics and sculpture,"² since none of the objects containing designs which are introduced by him in illustration of this supposed feature of the school were found on the site of the "Library"³ and there is not the slightest reason for supposing that any of the designs represent the work of temple pupils. Until, therefore, satisfactory evidence is furnished, scholars must necessarily question whether "clay figurines, terra-cotta reliefs and even fragments of sculpture were discovered in the ruins of the temple library."⁴ There

¹ Three volumes of syllabaries, writing exercises and mathematical and astronomical tablets are announced to appear—i. e. the ordinary texts belonging to a temple school and having nothing to do therefore with a "Temple Library."

² *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 527; *Ausgrabungen, etc., im Bel-Tempel*, pp. 59; English translation, p. 112.

³ Two of the designs (*Explorations*, pp. 528-529) on clay tablets were in the hands of the architect of the fourth campaign several months before Haynes struck the "Library" site, while a third design referred to by Hilprecht (*l. c.*, p. 527) as that of "a poorly executed bird" on a clay tablet and pictured in the German edition of the lecture on the temple of Bel (p. 59) as "the drawing of a temple pupil" ("Zeichnung eines Templeschülers"), is *not on a clay tablet at all* but is incised on a fragment of a stone vase—apart from the fact that it likewise was unearthed before the "Library" site was reached and therefore has nothing to do with the "Library." When confronted with this, Dr. Hilprecht put in the claim that the bird referred to in *Explorations*, etc. was not the one pictured in the German lecture, but it is only necessary to compare the two passages to see that he is speaking of one and the same object. If not—where is the other bird? A "map of Nippur," also spoken of by Hilprecht (*Explorations*, p. 516) as having been found in a jar on the "Library" site *after* his arrival at Nippur, was actually found several months *before* his arrival, and not in a jar, nor on the "Library" site. See Fisher's recent work, *Expedition to Nippur* (Phila. 1906), Part i, p. 12.

⁴ *Explorations*, p. 527.

remains in Hilprecht's account of the temple school, what he says about writing exercises, sign lists, syllabaries, grammatical paradigms and multiplication tables and which may be taken as reliable, though exactly how many of these tablets were found or how many he has seen, has not yet been ascertained.¹ What Dr. Hilprecht says about the methods followed in the training of young aspirants to knowledge is paralleled in chap. iii of Scheil's work above referred to,² and has substantially been known to scholars for many years from the similar classes of tablets found in Ashurbanapal's library.³ As in the case of the temple school of Sippar, we should also expect to find some distinctly literary tablets in that of Nippur. According to Hilprecht,⁴ some neo-Babylonian hymns were included in the circa 4000 tablets found by Peters in mound 5 in 1889-90. Exactly how many additional literary tablets were found by Haynes in 1900, we, unfortunately, have no means of determining from the data available. Dr. Hilprecht speaks in one place of "many" astronomical, medical and historical tablets,⁵ and in another place, "of hundreds of very large crumbling tablets mostly religious and mythological in character,"⁶ but inasmuch as the only distinctly "literary" tablet introduced by him in his various accounts of the library—

¹ Presumably the 15 or 20 tablets left unpacked by Haynes (see above, p. 158, note 1) for Hilprecht's inspection on his arrival were such writing exercises, "syllabaries and multiplication tablets which Haynes, although unable to read the inscriptions, selected because they were not like the ordinary business documents. To these may be added the similar class of tablets found, according to Hilprecht, by Peters in 1889-90. On p. 526 of *Explorations in Bible Lands*, Hilprecht speaks of having seen "hundreds of them [namely, syllabaries, and lexicographical lists] among the tablets which I have cleaned and examined in Nuffar and Constantinople." The statement is misleading, inasmuch as it implies that he saw more than 20 in Nippur, which was not the case. If really hundreds were found (which is not improbable but for which further evidence is desired), why did he not use as illustrations some of those hundred instead of a bought multiplication tablet and a second one, not found on the site of the "Library?"

² P. 153.

³ See, e. g., an article by the writer on "The Text Book Literature of the Babylonians," in the *Biblical World*, vol. ix, pp. 248-268, and Menant's *La Bibliothèque du Palais de Nineve* (Paris, 1880), chap. 3.

⁴ *Explorations in Bible Lands*, p. 511.

⁵ *L. c.*, p. 529.

⁶ *L. c.*, p. 530.

the astronomical tablet purchased before the excavations began¹—was *not* excavated at Nippur, it is natural that scholars should not be too eager to accept any very large figures without substantial proof.²

Sign lists, writing exercises, syllabaries and grammatical paradigms, mathematical tables and even chronological lists, hardly fall within the category of literary texts any more than modern text-books, though, of course, one may, if one is so inclined, designate them as such. It will, however, avoid confusion to separate a school outfit from literary productions, and, so far as the indications go, there is no reason at present to believe that either the number of school tablets or the number of literary tablets, in the strict sense, found in the temple archive at Nippur exceeds the number unearthed at Sippar. Assuming, however, that it should develop (which in the interest of science is to be hoped) that in reality several hundred literary texts are included in the 17,200 tablets found by Haynes, and in the circa 4000 found by Peters, even this would not justify us in assuming the existence of a "Temple Library" at Nippur in any proper sense of the term, i. e., an extensive and miscellaneous collection of literary texts, gathered as was Ashurbanapal's Library from various centers. Even a few hundred literary tablets might constitute for the greater part merely the practice tablets, or the text books for the temple pupils. As a matter of course, "23,000 *literary* tablets" would constitute a genuine library, and scholars *relying upon this statement* had all along assumed, until disillusioned by recent revelations, that a genuine literary archive, comparable to the royal library of

¹ See above p. 158.

² In a lecture delivered by Dr. Hilprecht before the American Philosophical Society, March 3, 1905, on the "Temple Library at Nippur," and when specimens of the contents of the "Library" were exhibited, two small incantation fragments were the only ones that could, in the strict sense of the term, be denominated as "literary." A chronological list that was shown might perhaps be included under this term, but even such lists—found also at Sippar (cf. e. g., Scheil, *l. c.*, p. 103, No. 16)—formed part of the school outfit, or were drawn up as guides in the dating of business documents and not prepared from motives of historical interest. See Peiser, *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*, viii, pp. 1-6, on the purely practical purposes served by such lists—which, corresponding to our modern calendars, one would hardly class with "literary" products.

Nineveh, had been discovered at Nippur.¹ Since, however, apart from the fact that no evidence for the correctness of the statement has been furnished, the circumstances and facts above set forth speak against the statement, we may for the present dismiss it and rest satisfied with the assumption that what literary tablets have been found at Nippur constitute, as at Sippar, part of the school outfit, with the probability that—again as at Sippar—some of them may have formed part of the collection used by the temple officials in the cult and were kept within the school precincts as the natural depository. There is no more reason, on the basis of what we actually know, for speaking of a “Temple Library” at Nippur than for speaking of a Temple Library at Sippar, and indeed if we take Prof. Hilprecht’s own summary of the results reached at Abu Habba or Sippar, as given by him on pp. 274–75 of *Explorations of Bible Lands* and substitute “Nippur” for “Abu Habba,” we will obtain a fairly accurate view of the character of the find made by Haynes and Peters. To quote this description in part, “For the greater part these documents are of a business character, referring to the administration of the temple and its property . . . Among the tablets . . . there were many of a strictly literary character, such as sign lists and grammatical exercises, astronomical and mathematical text, letters, hymns, mythological fragments.” With the exception that sign lists and grammatical exercises are not of a “strictly literary character,” and that the “letters,” since they no doubt refer to business matters, should likewise not be classed among literary tablets, the description may stand, and applies *precisely* to the Nippur finds. As

¹ I myself until recently accepted Dr. Hilprecht’s accounts in good faith. See the German edition of the writer’s *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, i, p. 10. Sayce too assumed on the basis of Hilprecht’s announcements that an extensive literary collection had been discovered (*Gifford Lectures on the Religions of Ancient Egypt and Babylonia*, London, 1902), p. 254, and so did every one else. Fossey (*Manual d’Assyriologie*, I, p. vii), actually put the Kouyunjik and the Nippur “Libraries” on the same plan. His words “voilà qu’on annonce de Nuffur la découverte d’une bibliothèque non moins considérable” (than that of Kouyunjik) may be taken as an illustration of the impression that Hilprecht’s accounts conveyed to the minds of scholars, and which now turns out to have been totally misleading. That under these circumstances scholars should have manifested their indignation is not surprising.

already intimated, until a considerable number of specimens of the business documents found in the temple archive of Nippur have been examined, the question cannot be definitely answered whether they are exclusively concerned with the administration and business affairs of the temple, as is the case with the tablets of the Cassite period found at mound 10,¹ or whether, as at Sippar, they include also business documents of a private character. Analogy would suggest that the temple at Nippur was also used as the official depository of commercial records in general—at least during certain periods—, though we must also assume that business firms kept their own archives.²

However this may be, on the basis of finds made at Telloh, and more particularly of those made at Sippar and Nippur, we are led to the conclusion (*a*) that the temples contained chiefly business archives, and (*b*) that attached to the temples in the large centers there were schools for the instruction of those to be trained as scribes and priests, and (*c*) that in the portion of the temple set aside for this purpose there were kept the text-books of various kinds, and in considerable number, including mathematical tables, tables of measurement, chronological lists, and astronomical tables, all serving some purpose in the instruction, as well as (*d*) religious texts for the training of those who were being prepared to carry out the various functions of the cult. We have also seen that it is probable that the religious texts—hymns, incantations, omens, and the like—actually used as guides or handbooks for the cult, were also kept in the school, but there is no reason for assuming that the number of such texts was ordinarily very large even in the great centers,—with one exception to be noted presently. So far as we have gone, therefore, there are no grounds for the belief that the Babylonian temples collected libraries in the proper and ordinary sense of the term, i. e., large literary archives like Ashurbanapal's collection.

Coming to the fourth site—Babylon—the disappointment of the scholars has been keen that the excavations conducted there by the German Oriental Society since 1899,³ while extremely valuable for the topography of the city, have not yielded a rich

¹ See above, p. 160, note 2.

² Above, p. 160, note 3.

³ Cf. *Mitteilungen der Deutsch. Orient-Gesellschaft*, especially Nos. 1-17.

supply of tablets—as little as the excavations carried on there fifty years previous—1852—by the French expedition under Fresnel and Oppert. Such tablets as have been found, however, by the recent excavations are of considerable value,¹ and bear, as we shall see, upon the main question under discussion. The native diggers and plunderers seem to have been more successful, and, at various times, thousands upon thousands of tablets emanating from Babylon and the neighboring site of el-Birs—the ancient Borsippa—on the other side of the Euphrates have through dealers found their way to the British Museum, to the Berlin Museum, and elsewhere, including museums in this country. Leaving aside the numerous brick stamps, barrel cylinders, and other inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar,² Nebopolassar, Nabonidus, and others, the great majority of these tablets are business documents belonging to the neo-Babylonian and Persian periods;³ and of these the majority again are of a private nature. At the same time there are quite a number that deal with the commercial affairs and transactions of the temples in Babylon and Borsippa. Since no reliable information is at our disposal regarding the exact portions of the mounds whence the Arabs obtained the Babylon and Borsippa tablets,⁴ the question cannot be answered whether they all emanate from the record

¹ Partial publication by Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen* (Leipzig, 1903).

² On the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar and their chronological order, see now Langdon's elaborate work, *The Building Inscriptions of the Neo-Babylonian Empire* (Paris, 1906), of which so far vol. i has been issued.

³ Almost all of the texts in the volumes of the Strassmaier and Evetts series (above referred to) that are not from Sippar come from Babylon and Borsippa. Similarly, almost all of the tablets included in Peiser's *Babylonische Verträge des Berliner Museums* (Berlin, 1890), come from Babylon. The Shemtob collection bought by the University of Pennsylvania (see above, p. 151, note 3), also appears to contain tablets from Babylon and Borsippa. The Metropolitan and Harvard Semitic museums also possess business documents coming from these two places.

⁴ Between 1885 and 1888 the Arabs appear to have been particularly active at these two places. In the *Journal Asiatique*, 1888, p. 543, Pognon reported that the Arabs claimed to have discovered a "library" in one of the mounds covering the site of Babylon, but the rumor turned out to be false. (Harper, *Zeits. f. Assyr.*, iv, p. 164.) Were these perhaps the tablets included in Reisner's *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen*. See below, p. 167.

offices in the temple of Marduk at Babylon and of Nebo at Borsippa respectively, or whether we are to assume, as at Nippur, the existence of private archives in these places kept by large business firms. We may with considerable confidence assume that such private archives did exist, but, on the other hand, since the temple organizations in Babylon and Borsippa engaged in business transactions, and since the administration of the temples at both these places was at least on as large a scale as at Telloh, Sippar and Nippur, the temples in question must have possessed extensive business archives, and analogy suggests that the temples likewise served (by the side of private archives) as depositories for commercial records of a private character.

The existence of temple schools at both places has also been satisfactorily established by the considerable number of syllabaries included among the tablets that have found their way to the British Museum. So, e. g., Part xii of the *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets*, etc., in the British Museum contains chiefly syllabaries, copied during the Persian period in the reigns of Cyrus and Artaxerxes from originals at Borsippa¹ and Babylon.² Confirmatory evidence is furnished by the discovery of an important syllabary at Babylon by the German expedition.³ An astronomical tablet found by this expedition⁴ presumably also belonged to the temple school at Babylon, while a sufficient number of distinctly literary tablets⁵ have also been unearthed at Babylon to warrant the conclusion that the temple school at Babylon—and no doubt also at Borsippa—contained religious texts—precisely as at Sippar and Nippur. Furthermore, Reisner⁶ has published about 200 fragments of tablets, chiefly hymns, but comprising also lists of gods, gates and streets in Babylon⁷ and omen texts⁸—united into ninety-four numbers—representing copies of texts prepared for the school during the Seleucidian era in the years 137–81,⁹ and which were said to have been

¹ See the colophons to Plates 3, 7, 9, 11, 15, 17.

² Colophon to Pl. 13.

³ Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen*, No. xi.

⁴ Weissbach, No. xvii.

⁵ Weissbach, No. xii and xiii. Announcements of others are made in the *Mitteilungen der Deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*.

⁶ *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen nach Thontafeln griechischer Zeit* (Berlin, 1896).

⁷ Nos. v–ix.

⁸ No. x.

⁹ See Banks, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen* (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 4–6.

found together in one place in Babylon.¹ The contents confirm the view that the texts were compiled for use in the Marduk cult, though, as has been shown elsewhere,² they were originally hymns and lamentation songs in honor of Bel of Nippur. Since, moreover, most of the tablets were written according to the colophons³ by members of one and the same priestly family—that of Sin-ibni, of whom three (whose names appear frequently) call themselves *kalû siḫru*, i. e., temple pupil,⁴ it follows that the collection was actually prepared in the temple school of Babylon, which is thus proved to have flourished close up to the beginning of our era. We may—provisionally, at least—assume in the case of Babylon and Borsippa, as in that of Sippar and Nippur, that in addition to texts prepared in the school by the pupils, or for the instruction of the pupils, the temple schools served also as the depository for the religious texts—hymns, incantations and omen rituals, and the like—used in connection with the cult. When we come to consider the evidence furnished by the tablets in Ashurbanapal's Library, we will find these conclusions and assumptions to be strengthened, more particularly so far as they bear on conditions prevailing in Babylon.

Our investigations, based on the results obtained up to the present time through systematic excavations, so largely supplemented by the unsystematic diggings of thievish Arabs, have thus far led us to the following conclusions: (1) that in the important religious centers, the temples had extensive archives attached to them; (2) that these archives contained, primarily, the records of the administration of the temples and of their business affairs, including official correspondence and business letters; (3) that in addition to temple records, business documents of a private character—contracts, deeds of sale, testaments, marriage settlements, etc., etc.—were deposited in the temple archives, though it is to be borne in mind that in the larger cities there were business firms, corresponding to our

¹ Reisner, *l. c.*, p. xi. See above, p. 166, note 4.

² See the author's *Religion Babylonians und Assyriens*, ii, p. 7 and 11, seq.

³ Reisner, *l. c.*, p. xi, seq.

⁴ A synonym of this interesting designation, signifying literally "little priest," is *dupšar siḫru*. See above, p. 153, note 9, and King, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, vol. I, p. cxiii seq., and Appendix I for practice tablets and commentaries prepared by and for the temple pupils.

banking houses and syndicates, that kept the records of their commercial instructions in their own archives ; (4) that besides acting as the official record-offices, the temples had schools attached to them for the education of priests and scribes ; (5) that in these schools the outfit for instruction in writing, reading, in mathematics, in measurements and astronomical calculations—sign lists, exercises, syllabaries, grammatical paradigms, mathematical tables, chronological lists, etc.,—were kept, besides practice tablets, commentaries to important texts, copies of religious texts—incantations, omens, prayers, hymns, rituals, ceremonial regulations, etc., etc.—and other material needed in the preparation of the students to conduct the cult and to carry out the various functions—exorcising of demons, purification and atonement rituals, inspection of sacrifices, interpretation of omens and the like—entrusted to the priests. The number of such texts thus covering the two main branches of a priest's education, (a) to act as a scribe in drawing up legal documents, and to conduct the business affairs of the temple, and (b) to become an adept in the cult with its numerous ramifications, must have been considerable in the temple schools of the large centers, ranging perhaps in the hundreds. At the same time we must beware of exaggerating the extent of the school outfit, for the intensely practical purpose served by these schools—in keeping with the practical aspects presented by the entire Babylonian religion—would act as a deterrent factor in gathering more than what was actually of service in the training afforded. As a sixth conclusion, it may be set down as probable that religious texts of various kinds used in connection with the cult were also kept within the precincts of the schools.

Naturally, every temple must have had somewhere, if not in the school then in some other part of the temple area, a number of religious texts—hymns, incantations, omens, forecasts, legends and myths¹—that were either directly employed in the cult or were consulted as guides in securing oracles and for the prognostication of future events ; but here again a warning is in place against giving our imagination free rein. While such collections made for purely practical purposes may have amounted in

¹ On the use of myths and legends in the cult, see the author's *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, i, p. 462–465, and his paper, “A Babylonian Parallel to Job” in vol. 25 of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

the larger temples to several hundred tablets, there is no evidence at present that the Babylonian temples had very extensive literary collections—at all comparable to such a collection as was gathered by king Ashurbanapal in his palace at Nineveh, which is the only collection so far found in Mesopotamia that merits the name of a library, in the sense in which that term is ordinarily understood. At all events, the term having been preëempted by the general consensus of Assyriologists for Ashurbanapal's collection, we have no right to apply it to what has been found in Babylonian temples as long as no actual evidence is at hand for the existence of an *extensive* literary collection of a similar character in any of them. To do so is to create needless and unwarranted confusion. As a matter of course, the possibility of the existence of genuine temple libraries in Babylonia is not denied; and in view of the surprises that archæological exploration has furnished in the past, he would be bold indeed who would take upon himself the rôle of a prophet; but the excavations conducted in the mounds of Babylonia have proceeded far enough to warrant a skeptical attitude towards this possibility with the exception of one center—Babylon, and, perhaps also Borsippa as an adjunct to Babylon.

The Babylonian religion, as has already been intimated, was intensely practical in its character, and this practical character is revealed in the religious texts of Babylonia so far as known to us from discoveries in Babylonian mounds and from the evidence to be derived from the texts in Ashurbanapal's library. The practical motive presiding over the constitution of the schools would prompt the priests in each temple to gather and preserve such texts that would be needed for the various branches of the cult, but here the interest in collecting would naturally cease. To go beyond this natural limit a motive would be required, and since an extensive literary collection—a real library—could only be brought together in any one center by gathering, in addition to the texts required for the cult of the particular deity to whom the temple in question was sacred, such as were used elsewhere, it follows that, unless some motive for doing so be apparent, the presumption would be against the prevalence of such a policy.

Before, therefore, even the assumption should be permitted for any particular religious center that an extensive literary col-

lection may have been gathered there, a motive sufficiently strong to warrant the priests, as the originators and preservers of literary productions, to pass beyond the immediate interests of the local cult (which would be satisfied by a comparatively small number of texts), would have to be demonstrated. Now what interest would the priests of Nippur, devoted to the service of Bel, have in gathering the texts used in the cult of Ningirsu at Lagash? Or, why should the priests of Sippar, with Shamash as the patron deity of the place, collect hymns, prayers, ritualistic ordinances, or even incantations and festal legends connected with the cult of Ea at Eridu? Political conditions and religious interests go hand in hand in ancient Babylonia. Until the days of Hammurabi, the Euphrates Valley was divided into a number of independent states or kingdoms, and while, at one time or the other, one center or the other exercised a certain supremacy over one or more of the other states, there was not, so far as the evidence goes, prior to Hammurabi, any central power in control of all of Babylonia. Sargon of Agade, and some of the rulers of Lagash and of Ur, represent the nearest approach to such a power, without, however, achieving the union of the various districts of Babylonia, which was the work reserved for Hammurabi, who thereby laid the foundations of a genuine empire with the city of Babylon as the political center. Unless, therefore, we are to assume a sufficiently strong literary interest among the priests in the collecting of religious and other texts to counterbalance the natural rivalry among the cults which would result from the political rivalry among the different states, there would be no motive to prompt the priests of any particular temple to gather texts produced and used elsewhere. There is, however, nothing to indicate that literature as an intellectual pleasure and stimulus was a compelling factor in ancient Babylonia. The fact that the bulk of the literature is religious, produced directly for the purposes of the cult, and thus serving a purely practical purpose, is a strong argument against such an assumption, and since the only two sciences cultivated in Babylon—astronomy and medicine—were encouraged *because* of their practical bearings, astronomy as a means of forecasting human destinies, and medicine only in so far as it furnished a knowledge of certain remedies ascertained to be beneficial when applied in connection with incantations that continued to be

regarded as no less essential to the healing of disease, we may at the most assume that texts belonging to these two classes would be transferred from one religious center to the other ; and even here we have to take into consideration, as a deterrent factor, the jealousy with which such texts would be guarded by the priests of one center to prevent a rival cult from obtaining possession of such valuable treasures.

The conditions, however, for gathering the texts produced in the various temples in some central place would be more favorable after the creation of a Babylonian empire under Hammurabi, and there would also be a strong motive for collecting such texts in the temple of Marduk at Babylon. The political union of the Euphratean states led as a natural result not only to the recognition of the city of Babylon as the political center, but to the endeavor to place Marduk at the head of the Babylonian pantheon, and which in time was accomplished. The process involved the transference to Marduk of the prerogatives enjoyed by the other great gods—notably by Bel of Nippur, but also by Ea, Ninib and Shamash. Under such conditions there would arise a genuine and a strong motive for collecting in the Marduk temple at Babylon, texts produced in other centers—not, to be sure, from any purely literary instincts, but with the specific purpose of adapting these texts to the cult of Marduk. The proof is abundant that this plan was actually carried out ; that entire series of incantations compiled originally for the Ea cult were transferred to Marduk with such modifications as were called for ;¹ that Bel and Ea hymns² and Bel and Ninib legends³ were transferred to Marduk, and that in so far as any monotheistic tendencies existed at all in Babylonia, they are intimately bound up with this endeavor to assign to Marduk and to concentrate in him the attributes, powers, and prerogatives of the other great gods—Bel, Ea, Sin and Shamash, Ninib and Nergal—each one of which had his own center of worship.⁴ As a single striking and characteristic instance of this centralizing process, the main

¹ See Jastrow, *Rel. Babyl. und Assyrl.*, i, p. 295 seq., 329 seq., etc.

² See above, p. 168, and Jastrow, *l. c.*, i, pp. 495 seq., and ii, pp. 19 seq.

³ The detailed proof in the forthcoming Part 13 of the author's *Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*.

⁴ In this sense the famous monotheistic Marduk hymn (see Jastrow, *l. c.*, i, pp. 421-423) is to be interpreted. See now also Baentsch, *Altorientalischer und Israelitischer Monotheismus* (Tübingen, 1906), p. 33 seq.

version of the Babylonia creation story as set forth in tablets from Ashurbanapal's library supplemented by Babylonian originals¹ may be cited in which two older versions—one belonging to Eridu, in which Ea was regarded as the conqueror of the monster (or monsters) of the deep; another originating in Nipur, in which Bel after the overthrow of Tiamat, becomes the creator of the orderly world,—are combined into a version celebrating Marduk as the great hero among the gods.² The actual transfer of the rôles of Ea and Bel to Marduk is indicated in the explicit statement that these gods gave their names, i. e., according to ancient ideas, their power and essence, to the god of Babylon.³ There are good reasons for believing, therefore, that in the Marduk temple at Babylon there may have been gathered in this way a collection of considerable extent—perhaps, of sufficient extent to justify us without involving us in a confusion of terms, in speaking of it as a veritable “Temple Library,” though it is only proper to add that even on the assumption that this centralizing process assumed the largest possible dimensions, we would still be far removed from such a condition as applies in the case of Ashurbanapal's collection, where the king from motives of pride and ambition and with a view of emphasizing his control of Babylonia, and perhaps also for the purpose of symbolizing the religious preëminence of his capital, Nineveh, carried out on a large scale the policy of having the texts connected with the cult of the gods in the various religious centers of the south copied from the originals into the Assyrian or neo-Babylonian⁴ *ductus* of cuneiform writing and placed in his palace. It may well be doubted whether even the temple of Marduk ever possessed “23,000 literary tablets.” Up to a certain extent, the conditions in Babylon hold good for the adjacent Borsippa. For reasons that need not be

¹ See King's standard edition, *Seven Tablets of Creation*, vol. i. Introduction, p. cxi seq.

² See the author's paper “On the Composite Character of the Babylonian Creation Story” in the *Nöldeke Festschrift* (Giessen, 1906), pp. 970-982.

³ Tablet VII, lines 110 and 118-120 (King's edition).

⁴ A large number of the tablets in the Kouyunjik collection are written in the neo-Babylonian style—an indication that both forms of writing were in use in Assyria, rather than that some of the scribes were Babylonians.

set forth here, the worship of Nebo was closely combined with that of Marduk, and it may be that in Borsippa likewise, as a sort of adjunct to Babylon, a genuine literary collection was formed, though, perhaps, never disassociated from the school, and certainly never attaining the proportions of the collection of Babylon.

The question, then, whether the Babylonian temples had libraries may, on the basis of the actual results obtained through excavations in southern mounds, be answered as follows. The evidence does not point to the existence of extensive literary collections in the religious centers of Babylonia, and what evidence there is favors the supposition that, with the exception of the Marduk temple at Babylon—and possibly of the Nebo temple at Borsippa—the actual number of literary texts in each center was limited to such as were directly connected with the cult of the chief deity in that place, or, where several gods were worshipped, with the worship of these gods in their respective sanctuaries. There may have been a transfer from one center to the other of omen and medical texts to a certain extent, but even with such borrowing the number of literary texts in the Babylonian temples does not as a rule appear to have been very large. There is certainly no reason at present to assume that all the larger temples of Babylonia—and much less those of minor importance—had extensive literary collections—libraries in any proper sense of the term, while even in the case of Babylon there are no good reasons for believing that the literary tablets in the Marduk archive ranged high into the thousands.

There still remains to be considered the testimony furnished by Ashurbanapal's library on the question under consideration. If the originals from which the texts in this library are copied are Babylonian, does not the existence of this large royal collection point to an extensive literature scattered throughout the religious centers of the south? Naturally, conclusions based on the actual number of tablets found in the royal palace at Nineveh must be accepted with due reserve,¹ since we have no means of ascertaining the original extent of the collection. Bezold,¹ whose opinions always merit the greatest weight, inclines to the belief that what has been recovered represents only a small proportion of the original extent, though he assigns no reasons for

¹ *Bibliotheks- und Schriftwesen im alten Nineve*, p. 273, note 3.

this belief. On the other hand, the circumstance that since the discovery of the library by Layard, the ruins at Kouyunjik have been searched more than half a dozen times by such explorers as Rawlinson, Rassam, George Smith, Budge and King,¹ for further fragments and with considerable care and success, lends a presumption to the view that, unless we are to assume the complete disappearance without any traces whatsoever of the greater part of the library, the portion now recovered represents at least the major portion of the collection. Twenty thousand tablets, it must be remembered, constitute a formidable collection, and even the ambition of such a king as Ashurbanapal, whose personal literary interests were presumably not very strong, might have been satisfied with an even smaller collection. However this may be, the recovered part is sufficiently large and covers a sufficiently wide range to enable us to strike an average as to the various divisions of the collection and to place considerable confidence also in the testimony furnished by the portion that has been found.² In the first place, then, attention should be directed to the fact that the proportion of the library which is of Babylonian origin is not so large as has sometimes been supposed. The collection is very far from being exclusively a borrowed product. Included in the somewhat over 20,000 tablets are over 2700 tablets,³ and fragments—or about one-eighth—comprising letters of Assyrian kings and their officials,⁴ and which are therefore of Assyrian origin. There are about 800 Assyrian business documents and about 600 astrological and astronomical reports to Assyrian rulers—likewise, therefore, of Assyrian origin.⁵ Again, there are extensive groups of tablets containing distinctively Assyrian prayers, as, e. g., the prayers of Asarhaddon

¹ See above, p. 147.

² Weber, in his recently published monograph, *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern* (Leipzig, 1906), p. 4, is likewise of the opinion that the proportion to one another of the various subdivisions into which the collection may be divided, can be gathered from the part of the library that has been recovered.

³ My calculations are based on the admirable Index to Bezold's catalogue.

⁴ 876 of these letters have been published by Harper in his magnificent series, *Assyrian and Babylonian Letters* (London 1892-1902, 8 vols.).

⁵ See Thompson, *Report of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon* (London, 1900, 2 vols.), for an extensive publication of such tablets.

and Ashurbanapal to the sun-god, published by Knudtzon.¹ An estimate of 500 tablets of this character will not be regarded as too large. Many of the omen and medical texts, while based on Babylonian prototypes, contain evidence of having been compiled by Assyrian priests.² Again, there is no reason to assume that the more than 2000 fragments of syllabaries, paradigms, lists of all kinds, of gods, stars, names, plants, animals, rivers, countries, temples, cities, clothing, ships, etc., are all copies of Babylonian originals. Indeed many of them may with certainty be set down as the work of Assyrian scribes.³ The Babylonian portion of the collection is still further reduced by the lists of Assyrian eponyms and the historical, building and votive inscriptions of Assyrian kings, included in the library—in all about 400 tablets and fragments—and further by the oracles and hymns of Assyrian origin. Striking a general average from the part recovered, it is safe to say that one-half and probably more than one-half of the collection is of Assyrian origin; and even in the genuinely Babylonian portion, the actual number of distinctively literary texts—subtracting all syllabaries, paradigms and lists—is further reduced by the very large number of duplicate texts copied in some if not in many instances from Assyrian originals.⁴ Thus of the Creation story at least five copies—besides four copies of neo-Babylonian editions not found at Kouyunjik—existed in the royal library;⁵ of the Gilgamesh

¹ *Assyrische Gebete an den Sonnengott*, etc. (Leipzig, 1893), besides texts like KK. 226, 418, 1285, 1286, 1290, 1291, 2809, 2810(?) 2836, 8361, 8363, 8845, 11367, Sm. 1537, 1630, Rm 2,329, 56-9-9,171, etc., etc., which, according to indications in Bezold's *Catalogue*, are prayers addressed to various deities by Assyrian kings and are, therefore, of Assyrian origin.

² The fact that in some cases the long colophons attached to the omen series do not contain the usual phrase *kîma labirišu šaṭir*, etc., "written like the original," etc., points in this direction. So, e. g., *Cuneiform Texts*, Part xx, pl. 33, and Boissier, *Documents Assyriens relatifs aux Presages*, p. 232. Moreover, a text like K. 102 (Boissier, *l. c.*, p. 47) is proved by the colophon to be an Assyrian product.

³ E. g., the so-called "Lehrbuch des Prinzen Asurbanipal" published by Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke* (3d ed.), pp. 86 seq. See Meissner's note on duplicates of this text in *Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung*, ix, pp. 162-163.

⁴ In this way the colophon *gabri Ašur* (see below, p. 178, note 1) is to be interpreted.

⁵ King, *l. c.*, I, p. cxv.

epic there are likewise several copies; of many hymns two or three copies,¹ and similarly of omen texts, astrological forecasts, incantation fragments, there are numerous duplicates, as well as of syllabaries, paradigms and lists.

All this goes to show that, on the one hand, we have been disposed to underestimate the literary activity prevailing in Assyria, and on the other hand, that the portion of the library recovered does not point to as extensive a Babylonian literature as has generally been assumed. The general dependence of Assyrian culture upon that of Babylonia does not involve the conclusion that Assyria was devoid of intellectual activity, nor that the Assyrian priests did not make contributions to the cuneiform literature that has come down to us; and while the originality of these contributions may not have been striking, the extent may have been considerable. Indeed, the existence of numerous large temples in Assyria is sufficient reason for assuming that the priests of Assyria were as active as those in the south, in compiling the texts needed for the cult, which involved a certain power of original composition, or at all events of adapting texts of various kinds to the specific cult in which they were interested.

Nor do the colophons attached in some instances to the copies, testifying to the place where the originals from which the copies were made, justify any far-reaching conclusions as to the extent of the literary collections in temple archives of Babylonia. In Bezold's catalogue only twelve instances of such colophons are registered, seven furnishing the testimony that the copies were made from originals in Babylon,² three from Nippur,³ one from Cuthah,⁴ one from Ur,⁵ while in some cases the colophon merely

¹ Of IV Rawlinson 60*, there are three and perhaps four copies. See Jastrow, *l. c.*, ii. p. 120, Anm. 1.

² KK. 872, 1812, 2221, 7931 (astrological forecasts); also 81, 2-4, 306 (religious), KK. 3266 (incantation) 3899 (astrological) colophons not given, but indicated by Bezold in his description of the texts.

³ KK. 1363 (incantation) 8668 (school tablet !) 10826 (religious). Official correspondence, as e. g. K. 7467, a letter from Nippur, is not of course included in the enumeration.

⁴ K 5268 (hymn to Nergal). Now published by Macmillan, *Beiträge zur Assyr.*, v, p. 582 seq.

⁵ K. 217, etc.—published by Boissier, *l. c.*, pp. 103-106 (omen).

testifies in a general way that the copies in question were made from other Assyrian¹ and Babylonian editions,² or referring in a still more general way to the fact that the text in question represents a copy³ or an extract.⁴ No doubt there were many more of such colophons attached to the tablets, the fragmentary condition of so many of which accounts for the fact that so few have remained, but it does not of course follow that large numbers of tablets were obtained from all the places mentioned. If the scribes of Ashurbanapal had confined themselves to copying the texts actually used in the cult, in one center or the other, the aggregate would have been considerable, even though the number in each place might not have been comparatively large, and as long as we have no certain criterion for determining the original extent of the royal library, no conclusions whatsoever can be drawn from the colophons as to the number of texts copied from the originals in any place.

More valuable and also more trustworthy is the internal evidence to be derived from the texts themselves, and here the result is to decidedly strengthen the conclusion reached from a different approach, that the Marduk temple at Babylon did actually possess a literary collection of considerable extent. On the assumption that the portion of the royal library recovered is sufficient to enable us to strike an average, it can be shown from internal evidence that the Marduk archive at Babylon constituted the chief source for Ashurbanapal's collection and that the number of texts derived from this source must have been considerable. It will be sufficient for our purpose to present here a portion of this evidence, reserving for a future occasion a more detailed investigation of this phase of the subject.

¹ E. g., *gabri Ašur* KK. 1315 (omen), 9672 (omen), i. e., a copy made from an Assyrian copy, or perhaps from an Assyrian original.

² *Gabri* (?) *Akkad* K. 8263 (astrological forecast) *gabri Ašur u Akkad* K. 2518, i. e., a copy made on the basis of Assyrian and Babylonian copies—indicating the preparation of further copies from copies.

³ E. g., KK. 398, 993 (*pī duppāni labirūti*), 3163, etc.

⁴ *Mukallimtu*, "specimen" which I take in the sense of an extract copied for school purposes or as a school exercise, e. g., KK. 872, 2139, 2177, 7628, 9048; Rm. 2, 103. See also KK. 3479, 4613, 5225, 9288, 9931; also *Cuneiform Texts*, Part xii, pl. 3, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, etc., etc., noted as "incomplete" copies; KK. 2773, 3931, 4630, 10595, 12188 DT. 1, etc., registered as "complete" copies.

Attention has already been directed to the main version of the Babylonian creation story,¹ which in the form preserved to us in Ashurbanapal's texts represents the Marduk version of the ancient myth and must therefore have been derived from originals in Marduk's temple at Babylon. Had Ashurbanapal's scribes obtained this tale from the archive at Nippur, we would have had the Nippur version with Bel as the hero, and if his scribes had struck a version in the Eridu archive, Ea would have played the prominent rôle. Again, in a large proportion of the incantation texts in the royal library, Marduk is prominently introduced, and since the internal evidence points to Eridu as the source for most of the texts of this class, the association of Marduk with Ea, and in many cases the assignment of the rôle of exorciser to Marduk by the express declaration of Ea,² points to the Marduk archive at Babylon as the source whence the incantations in Ashurbanapal's library are derived. Thirdly, the form in which a number of the myths and legends in the royal collection are preserved is the one which would be given to them under the influence of the Marduk priests. Thus, e. g., Adapa, originally an independent figure, is identified in the Kouyunjik version of the legend in which he plays the chief part with Marduk,³ and in the legend of the Zu bird likewise, the version preserved in Ashurbanapal's collection points to the substitution of Marduk for Bel.⁴ A fourth argument is furnished by the texts in Ashurbanapal's collection, to which parallels found in Babylon have been discovered. Thus an important hymn originally composed in honor of Bel of Nippur and transferred to Marduk, which was discovered by the German

¹ It may be worth noting that we have a fragment of an Assyrian version of creation in Ashurbanapal's collection (*Cuneiform Texts*, Part xiii, pl. 24-25) in which the head of the Assyrian pantheon, Ašur—identified by the Assyrian priests though without justification with An-šar—plays the chief part and which must therefore have been produced in Assyria—another bit of evidence for the intellectual activity prevailing in the north.

² In the formula so often occurring, "Ea said to Marduk, my son, what I know thou dost also know," etc.—See Jastrow, *l. c.*, i, pp. 295, 329, 338, 343, 344, Anm. 8, etc.

³ See Jastrow, *Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 548.

⁴ *L. c.* p. 542. The Ira (or Dibbarra) myth, in the form preserved in Ashurbanapal's library, likewise represents a "Babylon" version of the story. See Jastrow, *l. c.*, p. 532.

expedition,¹ is an exact duplicate to a text in Ashurbanapal's collection.² Of the series of texts published by Reisner³ and which are said to have been found together in Babylon, quite a number of duplicates exist in the Kouyunjik collection.⁴ Lastly, the large number of Marduk hymns in the collection,⁵ so much larger than those in honor of other gods, points decidedly in the same direction, since it is only fair to assume that they were all copied from the originals deposited in Marduk's temple at Babylon—the central and in fact the only seat of his worship. Incidentally, Ashurbanapal's library also bears further witness to the existence of an active temple school connected with the Marduk sanctuary, since many of the texts emanating from Babylon are practice tablets and commentaries, prepared for the interpretation of the texts in question.⁶

This circumstance, taken together with the large number of syllabaries, paradigms and school exercises of various kinds in the royal library, and which, in so far as they are not Assyrian originals, must have been copied from the texts in the temple schools of Babylonia, suggests the further conclusion that these schools constituted one of the chief sources of supply of the material gathered by the Assyrian scribes. The numerous lists of gods, objects of all kinds, countries, cities, mountains, rivers, birds, plants, etc., among the texts of the Library fall within the same category. and similarly the large numbers of ritual texts with detailed indications of the complicated ceremonial in

¹ Weissbach, *Babylonische Miscellen*, No. xiii.

² IV Rawlinson, 18, No. 2.

³ *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen* (Berlin, 1896). See above, p. 167.

⁴ E. g., Macmillan, *Some Cuneiform Tablets bearing on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (*Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, v), p. 538 seq., 571 seq., 580 seq.

⁵ Hehn, *Hymnen und Gebete an Marduk* (*Beiträge z. Assyriologie*, v, pp. 307–308), enumerates 25 hymns to Marduk. See, also, Jastrow, *Religion Babyloniens u. Assyriens*, i, pp. 495–519.

⁶ See, e. g., the interesting commentaries to the Creation story included in King's edition. If, as is fair to conclude, the Nergal hymns in Ashurbanapal's collection are copied from originals in Cutha—the seat of Nergal worship, then the existence of practice tablets among these, as suggested by Böllenrücher, *Gebete und Hymnen an Nergal* (Leipzig, 1904), p. 50, proves the existence of a temple school at this place likewise.

connection with sin and purification offerings,¹ appear to have been prepared for the instruction of the temple pupils rather than as guide books for the priests, and would thus also revert to the originals—in so far as they were not compiled by Assyrian pedagogues—in the temple schools of the south. The same applies to the considerable number of texts which are designated as extracts or incomplete copies² or bear the designation *nishû*,³ which seems to have been applied to a “school copy”⁴ of a text. In a general way, quite apart from the question from which Babylonian centers the copies in Ashurbanapal’s library emanate, one gains the impression that many of the omen, incantation, astrological, and even medical texts are school exercises, school copies or form part of school collections, belonging, therefore, to the school outfit of the temples rather than to a literary archive in the temple. A careful study of the texts in Ashurbanapal’s library from this point of view, with the purpose of ascertaining more definitely what proportion of the religious and other literary texts proper are to be classed as text-books rather than as parts of the outfit for actual use by priests in the service, has not yet been made. The result of such a study will in all probability tend to confirm the conclusion of a partial examination, that by far the *greater portion* of the literary texts falls within the category of school outfits in the larger sense, that is, texts prepared for purposes of instruction, and not representing part of the collection in the temples for use in the cult, so that, approached from this side, we are led likewise to the main conclusion of this paper, that we are justified in according to the temple schools of Babylonia considerable prominence, but that with the single probable

¹ See Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Babylonischen Religion* (pp. 81-175). The extensive Shamash-Adad ritual texts, of which Zimmern (*l. c.* pp. 190-219) furnishes specimens, belong to the same class of texts for the instruction of those intended to be trained for the service in the temples. These and other ritual texts are ably utilized by Morgenstern in his monograph, *The Doctrine of Sin in the Babylonian Religion* (Berlin, 1905).

² See above, p. 178, note 4.

³ E. g., KK. 8289, 9270, 9452, 9487, 10205, etc.

⁴ The proof for this view I must reserve for another occasion. The tablets which Bezold designates as “drafts” I am inclined to regard as school exercises also, e. g., KK. 6806, 8664, 80-7-19, 102, 80-7-19, 333, etc.

exception of the Marduk temple in Babylon—and possibly also the Nebo temple at Borsippa—the Babylonian temples do not give evidence of having contained extensive literary collections; that, on the contrary, the number of texts they contained, being in general limited to those used in the worship of the deity to whom the temple was sacred, appears to have been comparatively small, precisely as in the Egyptian temples,¹—altogether too small in extent and range to warrant the use of the term “literary.” For the present, therefore, and until further excavations should compel a revision of the conclusions to be drawn from the data at present available, the term “Library” should be restricted to the collection made by Ashurbanapal. At all events, a promiscuous use of the term “Temple Library,” to describe the contents of the temple archives in Babylonia, is to be discountenanced, not only as unwarranted, but as positively misleading, and as tending to create unnecessary and unjustifiable confusion.

¹ This on the testimony of Prof. W. Max Müller, to whom I am indebted for having called my attention to the fact.